



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,352	08/18/2000	Hidekazu Nagasawa	50090-237	5215

7590 05/04/2004

McDermott Will & Emery
600 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

TON, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

8

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/641,352

Applicant(s)

NAGASAWA ET AL.

Examiner

David Ton

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Req for Reconsideration filed 02/24/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 7, 10 and 13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 8.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Applicants Request for Reconsideration filed on 02/24/04 has been reviewed.
2. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. ' 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
4. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Sourgen et al.** (Sourgen) patent no. **5,850,452**.

As per claim 2:

Sourgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a data storage apparatus comprising a scrambling circuit for converting an input signal to a desired format, and a storage device for storing converted data wherein said scrambling circuit is constituted by a rewritable device [see claim 6].

As per claim 3:

Sourgen teaches said scrambling circuit includes a plurality of conversion circuits [permutation circuit DBr1-3 of Fig. 2] each converting said input signal according to different rules; and a selector [inherently in "selection of the bits permutation different from a rewritable memory to another", col. 4 lines 1-7] for selecting one of signal output by said plurality of conversion circuits and supplying what is selected to said storage device [ROM, RAM or EEPROM of Fig. 2].

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sourgen et al.** (Sourgen) patent no. **5,850,452** in view of **Kato et al.** (Kato) patent no. **4,680,791**.

As per claims 5 and 6:

Sourgen does not teach the scrambling circuit includes a digital processor for processing an output signal of an A/D converter.

Kato teaches a digital signal processor [see Fig. 1] including an A/D converter 8 and a scrambler circuit 11.

Art Unit: 2133

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply the teachings of Sourgen CPU for scrambling any signal such as an output signal of an AD converter taught by Kato. This modification would have been obvious and a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would enhance the application of Sourgen invention for processing analog signal.

7. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sourgen et al.** (Sourgen) patent no. **5,850,452** in view of **Maeda** patent no. **6,272,084**.

As per claims 8 and 9:

Sourgen does not teach an automatic address generation circuit for generating address signals for identifying storage locations in said storage device in response to external supplied commands.

Maeda teaches a memory controller [see Fig. 7] including an address generating part 27 and 28 for generating address signals for storage locations in response to external commands [col. 4 lines 16-36].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sourgen to include an address generator for generating address signals for storage locations in response to external commands as taught by Maeda. This modification would have been obvious and a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would simplify

Art Unit: 2133

the specification of address and complicated control become needless [see Maeda col. 4 lines 24-25].

8. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sourgen et al.** (Sourgen) patent no. **5,850,452** in view of **Itoi** patent no. **6,035,044**.

As per claims 11 and 12:

Sourgen does not teach the apparatus includes a compression circuit for compressing data.

Itoi teaches a scrambling circuit for scrambling video signal to output a main scrambled signal and a compressing circuit for compressing the main scrambled signal to thereby output a compress video signal [col. 3 lines 45-55].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sourgen to include a compression circuit for compressing data as taught by Itoi. This modification would have been obvious and a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would enhance the teaching of Sourgen for providing the compressing data output.

9. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 13 are allowed.

Response to Remarks

Art Unit: 2133

10. Applicant argued that (A) claim 2 of Sourgen does not describe the scrambling circuit is constituted by a rewritable device.

As to point (A), the Examiner agree with the Applicant that claim 2 of Sourgen does not describe the scrambling circuit is constituted by a rewritable device. However, Sourgen does describe the scrambling circuit is constituted by a rewritable device in claim 6. The Examiner admitted the error in citing to the wrong claim (claim 2 instead of claim 6) in the previous Office Action. The Examiner had tried to call the Applicant to clear the error, had pointed out to Applicant to look at claim 6 but the Applicant had refused to talk. Therefore, this Non Final Office Action is intended to correct that error even though the grounds of rejection are maintained as in previous Office Action.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Ton, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3043. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM and alternate Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady, can be reached at (703) 305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2133

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Ton", written in a cursive style.

DT

April 30, 2004

DAVID TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER